

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,866	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS9-2001-0230-US1	8104

7590 09/08/2004

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen  
P.O. Box 81641  
Austin, TX 78708-1641

EXAMINER
----------

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,866

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

Andrew L. Nalven

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/3/2004.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.
2. IDS submitted 3 June 2004 has been received and considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 13-14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berson US Patent No. 5,598,477. Benson discloses an apparatus for issuing and validating tickets.
5. With regards to claims 1 and 13, Berson teaches the receiving of a ticket from a ticket holder (Berson, column 4 lines 10-12), the ticket including a ticket identifier (Berson, column 3 lines 51-59), and one or more customer security features (Berson, column 3 lines 61-67, digital signature), determining whether the ticket holder matches one or more of the customer security features (Berson, column 4 lines 10-18, validation of digital signature, column 5 lines 20-25, comparison by OCR), and accepting the ticket in response to determining that the ticket holder matches one or more of the customer security features (Berson, Figure 2 Item 66, column 5 lines 26-28).
6. With regards to claims 2 and 14, Berson teaches the at least one customer security feature being selected from the group of a photograph, signature, digital

signature, fingerprint, and a customer description (Berson, column 3 lines 61-67, digital signature, column 3 line 66).

7. With regards to claims 3 and 5, Berson teaches the determining whether the ticket identifier is bound to any security features and accepting the ticket in response to determining that the ticket identifier is not bound to any security features (Berson, column 4 lines 19-22, validation by system operator).

8. With regards to claims 8 and 20, Berson teaches denying the ticket holder in response to determining that the ticket holder does not match one or more of the customer security features (Berson, column 5 lines 26-29).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4-6, 9-11, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berson US Patent No. 5,598,477 in view of Sansone US Patent No. 6,454,174. Sansone discloses a method for reading electronic tickets.

11. With regards to claims 4, 9 and 16, Berson teaches the scanning of a barcode printed on the ticket that corresponds to the ticket identifier (Berson, column 4 lines 10-12), but fails to teach the retrieving and comparing of stored customer information.

Sansone teaches retrieving one or more stored customer security features corresponding to the ticket identifier in response to the scanning (Sansone, column 7 lines 22-27, column 6 lines 36-40), comparing the stored customer security features to the customer security features included on the ticket (Sansone, column 7 lines 22-30), and accepting the ticket in response to the stored customer security features matching the customer security features on the ticket (Sansone, column 7 lines 22-30, validate ticket). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Sansone's method of storing customer information to allow comparison with Benson's ticket issuance and validation system because it offers the advantage of increasing the difficulty of ticket forgery by ensuring that all tickets have a unique number that identifies the purchaser of the ticket based upon information obtained during ticket purchase (Sansone, column 1 lines 45-65).

12. With regards to claims 5, 10 and 17, Berson as modified teaches the sending of a request to a security server with the request including a customer identifier (Sansone, column 7 lines 20-27, item 20), and receiving the security features from the security server in response to the request (Berson, column 4 lines 10-18).

13. With regards to claims 6, 11 and 18, Berson as modified teaches the sending of the merchant identifier to the security server (Sansone, column 7 lines 4-8, venue data), wherein the receiving of the security features is performed in response to the merchant identifier being authorized by the security server (Sansone, column 7 lines 17-21).

14. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berson US Patent No. 5,598,477 and Sansone US Patent No. 6,454,174, as applied to claims 5 and 17 above, and in further view of Bruce Schneier's Applied Cryptography.

15. With regards to claims 7 and 19, Berson as modified teaches a means for encrypting the request to the security server (Berson, column 6 lines 10-29), but fails to teach the request including a digital signature identifying the merchant. Schneier teaches the application of a digital signature (Schneier, Pages 34-35, Section 2.6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Schneier's digital signature method with Berson as modified because it offers the advantage of providing the receiver assurance that the document is unaltered and assurance regarding to the source of the request and signature (Schneier, Page 35, Section 2.6).

16. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berson US Patent No. 5,598,477 and Sansone US Patent No. 6,454,174 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Bruce Schneier's Applied Cryptography.

17. With regards to claim 12, Berson as modified teaches a means for encrypting the request to the security server (Berson, column 6 lines 10-29), but fails to teach the request including a digital signature identifying the merchant. Schneier teaches the application of a digital signature (Schneier, Pages 34-35, Section 2.6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Schneier's digital signature method with Berson as modified because it offers the

Art Unit: 2134

advantage of providing the receiver assurance that the document is unaltered and assurance regarding to the source of the request and signature (Schneier, Page 35, Section 2.6).

### ***Conclusion***

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. Goldstein et al US Patent No. 6,216,227 discloses a multi-venue ticketing system using smart cards.


20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L Nalven whose telephone number is 703 305 8407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703 308 4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Naiven

  
GREGORY MORSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100